

**R E M A R K S**

Claims 1-10 and 13-18 are pending in the application. Claims 13-18 are allowed and claims 2-10 are allowable.

The Abstract of the disclosure is objected to as being informal. A substitute abstract is submitted herewith. It is respectfully requested the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to independent form to include the limitations of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-10 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify applicant's claimed invention.

Claim 13 has been amended to include the last three words in the claim which were inadvertently dropped when filed.

Claims 18-32 have been newly added. These newly added claims recite a switching center system and include features from claims 1-10. The claims differ from the prior art and include a unique combination of features which are supported by the original specification and claims. No new matter is entered.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA). The Office Action argues that claim 1 is fully disclosed in the AAPA as a switching center (a mobile-service switching center) comprising a determining section, an event detecting section and a call-number changing section. Further the Office Action asserts the AAPA teaches the same functions as those recited in original claim 1.

However it is respectfully submitted that the AAPA merely discloses that a network side selects a call to be continued and discards other calls, when only a single call becomes allowable to continue.

Applicant's claimed invention includes: determining whether a call request is a call from the first multicall communication mode supporting terminal or from the single-call communication mode supporting terminal

The AAPA does not mention that the switching center side determines whether a call request is a call from a multicall communication mode supporting terminal, or a call from a single-call communication mode supporting terminal.

In addition the AAPA, when the switching center receives a call connection request under the congested state, the switching center disconnects a call, or selects a call based on a priority.

However, the AAPA does not teach that the event detecting section detects event caused by a handover occurrence or fluctuation of congested state

In contrast applicant claims detecting an event caused by a handover occurrence or fluctuation of a congested state of a network, by a reception of a handover requesting signal or an increase of a load representing the congested state of the network;

In addition to that, if a subscriber has a communication under the multicall mode, and due to an environmental change during the communication, desired call selected by the subscriber can be continued.

It is respectfully submitted that applicant's claim 1 is different from the AAPA and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Please charge the amount of \$144 for 8 extra claims and \$264.00 for three extra independent claims to Deposit Account 50-1290.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider

this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian S. Myers  
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304  
Telephone: (212) 940-8703  
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987  
Docket No.: FUJS 18.150 (100794-11594)  
BSM:fd